

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

United States of America,	)	CRIMINAL NO. 5:01-84-CMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
	)	
Endremolino Govan,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion requesting termination of supervised release. ECF No. 350 (filed Mar. 23, 2012).

The United States Probation Office has notified this court by letter that it opposes the request at this time, but recommends placing Defendant on minimum risk supervision and termination of supervised release if Defendant completes half of his term of supervised release without incident (March 26, 2013). The Government has indicated that it agrees with the position of the Probation Office.

Title 18 United States Code Section 3583(e) provides that

The court may, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)--

(1) terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice . . . .

Considerations contained in § 3553 include, *inter alia*, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; the ability to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; the need to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and the need

to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. 18 U.S.C. § 3553.

“The plain language of the statute illustrates that § 3583(e), in the typical case, allows a conduct-based inquiry into the continued necessity for supervision after the individual has served one full year on supervised release.” *United States v. Pregent*, 190 F.3d 279, 282-83 (4th Cir. 1999).

However, the statute

is not exclusively limited to considerations of conduct. The language of the statute notes that the district court ‘may’ terminate supervised release ‘if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.’ The phrase ‘the interest of justice’ does give the district court latitude to consider a broad range of factors in addition to an individual’s behavior in considering whether to terminate the supervised release period.

*Id.* at 283 (citation omitted).

Defendant has been compliant with all terms of his supervised release, including successfully passing all drug screening tests. Accordingly, the court will consider termination of Defendant’s supervised release, as of March 26, 2013, provided the United States Probation Office reports no violations of the terms of supervision between now and that time. Therefore, Defendants’ motion for termination of supervised release is **denied without prejudice**. The United States Probation Office shall, in its discretion, place Defendant on minimum risk supervision.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
April 3, 2012